

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 543

EA 018 221

AUTHOR Christensen, James E.
TITLE Educology for Freedom and Teacher Education: An Emerging Curriculum Issue in the Preparation of Teachers.
PUB DATE Jul 85
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the South Pacific Association for Teacher Education (Hobart, Tasmania, Australia, July 22-26, 1985). For related documents, see EA 018 219-220.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum; Curriculum Development; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; Futures (of Society); Teacher Education; Technological Advancement; Vocabulary
IDENTIFIERS *Educology

ABSTRACT

Current curricula, focusing on education for employment, will not be appropriate for a future in which demands and needs for employment are drastically altered by technological developments. Prospective teachers should address this situation in the course of their educological studies and apply the three kinds of understanding gained through educological study (qualitative, quantitative, and procedural) to developing new, more appropriate curricula. This paper reviews the distinction between education (a field of phenomena) and educology (the fund of knowledge about education), describes the kinds of knowledge encompassed by educology, considers the personal attributes of teachers that can be furthered through educological study, and suggests possible educational objectives that can be sought as alternatives to objectives centering around employment. The paper concludes by recommending development of a curriculum based on the enhancement of self-determination, individuality, and intelligent action. (PGD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED266543

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*J. E.
Christensen*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Educology for Freedom and Teacher Education:
An Emerging Curriculum Issue in the Preparation
of Teachers

James E. Christensen
Riverina Murray Institute
Wagga Wagga, N.S.W.

A paper presented to the Annual Conference
of the South Pacific Association for Teacher Education
Hobart, Tasmania, July 22-26, 1985

LA 018 221

There is the educational process, and there is the fund of knowledge about that process. That fund is educology. It includes analytic, normative, and empirical (scientific and praxiological) knowledge about education. In their preparation to become teachers, individuals need to develop their understanding of educology in order to become situationally sensitive, theoretically adequate, and procedurally sound with respect to the educational process. An important issue which prospective teachers should address in their educological studies is the question of an appropriate curriculum for children who will, in all probability, encounter a future with permanent technological unemployment. In such social and economic circumstances, a curriculum which emphasises education for freedom and education for living well as a human being should take priority over a curriculum which emphasises education for employment. A curriculum which derives from education for freedom encompasses the learning goals of the ability to enter into caring relationships, engage in sound inquiry, and undertake well informed social and political action.

The educational process is essentially one in which someone undertakes to learn something under the guidance of someone else. This may be a child learning language from its parents, an employee learning business procedure from an employer, a pupil learning dance from a primary school teacher, or a university student learning paleontology from a professor. Learning can be achieved without guidance, as in trial and error, by accident, or through systematic research. Such learning extends beyond the educational process. Learning within the educational process is achieved through someone placing themselves under the discipline and guidance of another. The basic components of the educational process are student, teacher, content, and social and cultural milieu. The student may be a clerk, mother, policeman, cousin, taxi driver, virtually anyone in any walk of life. Undertaking to learn under guidance is not confined solely to school pupils or university students. Everyone, at times, engages in guided study. The teacher

may be, at times, a soldier, farmer, father, brother, virtually anyone. The activity of teaching is not confined to the classroom or to school teachers. Everyone, at times, teaches. The content which is taught or studied may be tying shoelaces, swimming, driving cars. It may be history, geography, or chemistry. It may be solving quadratic equations, designing a bridge, planning a conference. It may be attitudes, such as competitiveness or cooperativeness, or it may be viewpoints, such as individualism or communalism. The social milieu in which the educational process operates can, at times, be the family, the church, peer groups, the work place, hotels, trains, conferences, schools, colleges, universities. The cultural milieu in which education functions might be French, American, Australian, Spanish, and so forth. In addition to the four basic components of education, there are a number of components which are derivative of the four. These include intentions, methods, styles, resources, and language. Educational goals, aims, and objectives emanate from the intentions of teachers, students, and those who comprise the social and cultural milieu. Educational methods include, for example, questioning, demonstrating, explaining, narrating, and both teachers and students use methods in their respective tasks. Educational styles include, for example, supportive, nonsupportive, enthusiastic, and diffident styles. Both teachers and students manifest styles in their use of educational methods. Educational resources are all of those physical objects which teachers and students use, for example, projectors, films, microcomputers, books, paper, paints, musical instruments, and so forth. Language which is used within the educational process has a cultural and social identity. Its cultural identity, for example, is Russian, Spanish, or English. Its social identity is, for example, middle class or working class. Also, language within the educational process divides into ordinary, conversational language and specialised language, such as that used in chemistry, medicine, mechanical repairs, or horse husbandry.

Distinct from the educational process is the fund of knowledge about that process. This fund consists of the recorded true propositions about education. An appropriate name for the fund is educology. All other candidates (education, pedagogy, ethology, psychopedagogy, androgogy) name either more or less than knowledge about education. The term 'education' names both the educational process and the fund of knowledge about it. This is something like using the term 'society' to name sociology or the term 'animals' to name zoology. Clearly society and sociology are not identical, nor are animals and zoology. Likewise, the educational process is not the same as the fund of knowledge about it, and undesirable confusion is generated from the practice of using the term 'education' to name both the process and the fund of knowledge about it. The term 'pedagogy' is derivative from the Greek terms 'paidos' (meaning children) and 'paidagogia' (meaning a tutor of children). The educational process includes more than the education of children and the practice of teaching or tutoring children, thus pedagogy is an inadequate term for naming (and only naming) the fund of knowledge about education. Similar faults are inherent in the use of ethology, psychopedagogy, and andragogy. Ethology was proposed by J.S. Mill (1846, Book VI, Chapter V, Paragraph 4). It derives from 'ethos' (meaning character of a group) and '-logy' (meaning knowledge about). Education is a factor in the formation of a group's character, but character formation as a process includes far more than education. Thus, the term 'ethology' names more than knowledge about education. 'Psychopedagogy' has been offered by Stones (1979). He recognised the inadequacy of the term 'pedagogy', and he wished to give emphasis to the contributions which psychology can make to teaching practices. The inadequacies of 'pedagogy' as a name for knowledge about education have already been explicated, and the addition of the term 'psycho-' does not delimit the meaning of the term to knowledge about education. To the contrary, it broadens the meaning of the

term to include mind (from psyche) as well as the process of educating children and teaching or tutoring children. The term, however, leaves out or excludes the concept of the fund of knowledge about the entire educational process, from childhood through adulthood. In recognition of this, Knowles (1970) coined the term 'andragogy' in connection with his work with adult education. He argued that effective teaching of adults (andragogy) differs from teaching children (pedagogy). The use of the term 'andragogy' has at least two difficulties associated with it. It does not distinguish clearly between the process of adult education and the fund of knowledge about adult education, and it does not function adequately as a name for adult education. The term derives from the Greek 'andros', meaning male adult, thus 'androgogy' names, not adult education, but only the teaching or tutoring of male adults. Only the term 'educology' names and only names the fund of knowledge about education.

Educology contrasts with other funds of knowledge (such as psychology, sociology, anthropology) in that it is the only fund which treats the educational process as the dependent variable. It views other factors (e.g., social class, economic systems, politics) in terms of how they influence the educational process. This can be illustrated by comparing the educology of society with the sociology of education. In the first, education is taken as the dependent variable, and it is analysed in terms of how social divisions, aspirations, organisation, and conflicts affect the educational process. In the second (the sociology of education), society is taken as the dependent variable, and education is analysed in terms of how it influences society (e.g., promotes or mitigates social divisions and conflict). So it is with the anthropology of education and the educology of cultures. The first focuses upon how education influences cultures. The second examines how cultures affect education. Likewise, the psychology of education investigates how education affects the function of mind. The educology

of mind characterises how the human mind influences the educational process.

Educology is not a discipline. (Neither is sociology, anthropology, physics, or chemistry, for that matter.) But it takes discipline to form or produce educology. Discipline is the set of rules, logical operations, and procedures which researchers or inquirers must use in their investigations to verify or refute knowledge claims. If research is successful, it produces a set of true statements (a fund of knowledge), and educological research, if successful, produces a set of true statements (propositions) about the educational process. That set of statements is educology. At least three kinds of discipline are required to produce educology, viz., empirical, analytic, and normative. The three kinds of discipline produce three kinds of knowledge. Empirical discipline is the set of rules which require the use of observation to aduce evidence to substantiate a knowledge claim. Successful empirical inquiry produces empirical knowledge, i.e., statements which are true (or have a high degree of probability of being true) because they correspond with observable evidence. Empirical knowledge about education divides into at least two categories, viz., knowledge about about extant educational phenomena and knowledge about effective educational practices. Knowledge about extant educational phenomena is scientific educology. Knowledge about effective educational practices is praxiological educology. (Steiner, 1981). An example of scientific educology is the statement, "A common practice in high schools is to arrange students into groups according to learning ability." An example of praxiological educology is the statement, "An effective way of promoting learning is to keep students on the learning task." Scientific educology describes what actually is the case or what actually happens within the educational process. Praxiological educology describes educational practices (e.g., teaching methods, study methods) which are effective in achieving desired results or goals.

In addition to empirical discipline, analytic discipline is required to produce educology. Analytic discipline is the set of rules which requires the use of necessity reasoning to adduce evidence to substantiate a knowledge claim. Successful analytic inquiry produces analytic knowledge, i.e., statements which are true because they cohere with the necessary implications of the conceivable evidence of concepts and propositions. An example of analytic educology is the statement, "The activity of teaching implies the intention that a student learn something," and the statement, "The activity of teaching requires that a student be present." All statements about education which are true by necessary implication are analytic educology. Normative discipline is the set of rules which require evaluative reasoning to adduce evidence to substantiate a knowledge claim. Normative discipline, if used successfully, produces normative knowledge, i.e., statements which are true because they cohere with a set of values to which we reasonably adhere. An example of normative educology is the statement, "Teachers are obligated to refrain from victimising their students," and the statement, "Students should not be treated prejudicially or unfairly with regard to their gender, national origins, or religious convictions." All statements about education which are true by evaluative reasoning are normative educology. (Christensen, 1981a, 1981b, 1983).

In their preparation to become teachers, individuals need to develop their understanding of educology in order to become situationally sensitive, theoretically adequate, and procedurally sound with respect to the educational process. These three attributes form the basis for professionalism in teaching at whatever level (preprimary, primary, secondary, tertiary, including university and college). Situational sensitivity is the ability to recognise and appreciate the needs of a particular student, what upsets and pleases that one student, what motivates that one student, what that one student is capable of achieving,

what that one student aspires to achieve, what supports and constraints that one student receives from the school, her or his peer group, family, and community. A situational sensitivity derives from a qualitative knowing (Maccia, 1973a,b,c), a knowing of that one particular student in all of her or his uniqueness. Students of educology can develop situational sensitivity by engaging in the educational process in a variety of roles, viz., as pupil, as teacher, as counselor, as administrator, as concerned parent or guardian. In addition, students of educology can develop situational sensitivity through analysis and reflection upon novels, short stories, films, and drama which depict unique individuals within educational situations, e.g., the novel, Tom by John Embling, the BBC television drama, Rhino, the film, My Brilliant Career. Situational sensitivity is requisite for transacting with an individual student as a unique being, that one person, as distinct from a category of students (e.g., preschoolers, gifted, handicapped, chemistry students). The second necessary attribute of professionalism in teaching, theoretical adequacy, is the ability to describe, explain, predict, argue evidentially, and justify criterially. This ability derives from a quantitative knowing (Maccia, 1973a,b,c), a knowing of educational phenomena as categories of events, relationships, and entities. Students of educology can develop theoretical adequacy by way of at least three avenues, viz., informing themselves of assertions about extant practices and relationships within the educational process, learning rules of evidence for making warranted assertions about education, and evaluating assertions about education in terms of the degree to which evidence supports or refutes those assertions. Theoretical adequacy (and quantitative knowing about education) is requisite for teachers to say what their educational practices are and why those practices are indicated or justified. The third necessary attribute of professionalism in teaching, procedural soundness, is the ability to intervene (or refrain from intervening) in the educational process in such a way as to enhance the probabilities of learning taking place.

This ability derives from a procedural knowing (Maccia, 1973a,b,c;;Christensen,1983), a knowing of what, how, and when to take action in order to achieve desired educational outcomes, or to enhance the probabilities of achieving desired outcomes. Procedural knowing can take a variety of forms, e.g., speaking (including questioning, explaining, directing, etc.), gesturing, silence, observing, demonstrating. Students of educology can develop their procedural knowing by several means. They can read praxiological educology and follow the principles recorded in that fund of knowledge. They can observe films of procedural experts (master teachers) and model themselves after those experts. They can work under the supervision and instruction of master teachers in practice teaching. They can analyse and evaluate their procedural soundness by viewing video recordings of themselves in action as teachers. Procedural soundness (and the procedural knowing from which it derives) is requisite for a professional teacher to stand accountable and be responsible to students and other interested parties (e.g., parents and guardians, taxpayers, administrators).

The three kinds of educological understanding (qualitative, quantitative, procedural) and the three attributes which derive from them (situational sensitivity, theoretical adequacy, procedural soundness) are located in the functioning of individuals, actual live people. In contrast, educology (the fund of recorded, verified and true propositions about the educational process) is located in books and other media (e.g., video tapes, audio tapes, computer discs). Through reading of educology, intelligently reflecting upon its meaning in relation to one's experience, and undertaking appropriate practice, an individual develops educological understanding. If that understanding is developed such that it encompasses qualitative knowing of education, the individual becomes ever more sensitive to particular educational situations in all of their uniqueness. Development of quantitative knowing about education enables the individual to undertake well informed and sound reasoning about education as a category of events, entities,

and relationships. If the understanding is developed to include procedural knowing, the individual is able to take constructive and productive action in educational states of affairs. They can expertly undertake the role of teacher, or counselor, or student, or all three. They can use a productive variety and combination of intentions, methods, styles, resources, language, content, and evaluation in relation to well articulated goals. Educological understanding can be lopsided, but this is not a desirable state of affairs. A paid teacher who has qualitative and quantitative, but not procedural knowing has not achieved professionalism. She or he is like the medical practitioner who can see that you are sick, tell you what is wrong with you, but does not know what action to take to relieve your distress and restore your health (even though other practitioners do know what action to take). Such a practitioner is not professionally qualified because of lack of procedural knowing. As it is among medical practitioners, so it is among teachers (of whatever level, preprimary through university): professionalism requires situational sensitivity through qualitative knowing; theoretical adequacy through quantitative knowing; and procedural soundness through procedural knowing. These are the basic educological understandings which are requisite for professionalism in teaching. Without these basics, those who undertake the activity of teaching are not professionals, regardless of whether they receive pay or are attached to an institution (i.e., a school, college, university, institute, academy).

Inherent in the activity of professional teaching is a sensitively conceived, well informed, and procedurally sound selection of educational goals, content, teaching and learning activities, and evaluation processes and uses which are appropriate for a particular set of pupils in a particular social and cultural milieu. An important and increasingly urgent emerging issue which prospective professional teachers should address in their educological studies is the question of an appropriate curriculum for

for children and youth who, in all probability, will encounter a future with permanent technological unemployment. What can educational institutions offer the children and youth of Australia who face a future of prolonged unemployment which might even stretch into a lifetime of unemployment? The counsel which youth most often receive is to stay in school as long as possible in order to improve their job prospects. But how sound is this counsel? Even if all youth stayed in school until age 18 (and even if they achieved equally high levels of learning), the labour market could not absorb them. Should an individual complete high school through Year 12, it may provide a competitive edge in the quest for employment, relative to others who left secondary school at the minimum age. But if all youth complete full secondary school, then no one has a competitive edge. To prolong the period of school attendance is to delay unemployment, not decrease it. The argument that schooling has instrumental worth for employment does not hold in an economy with a chronic shortage of jobs for its population.

On the other hand, is unemployment a necessarily undesirable condition? Within the Australian situation, it is a bad state of affairs because of the poverty and despair which result from it. Yet, there is nothing inherently wrong with being unemployed. It is only bad because two conditions accompany it: (1) no income and (2) a sense of self esteem which is predicated upon paid employment or activity for monetary return. The first difficulty, no income, can be resolved through the establishment of consumer democracy, a system of individual allowances which permits access to the necessities of modern life. Those necessities include decent housing, adequate diet, appropriate clothing, professional medical and dental care, speedy communication, convenient transport, sound schooling and education, ready access to information, and quality entertainment. Just as the basis for political democracy is universal suffrage, one vote of equal weight by each

individual, so the basis for consumer democracy is the guaranteed personal income, an adequate standard allotment to each individual. Existing unemployment benefits, social security payments, and pensions would be subsumed in such a system. For a society with permanent technological unemployment, a system of guaranteed, adequate personal income is not merely desirable. It is an economic and social necessity. The second difficulty associated with unemployment, the loss of self esteem, requires a reconsideration of what constitutes a worthwhile life in order to resolve it. In a highly industrialised and technological society, it is inadequate to predicate the good life upon mass production, planned obsolescence, and mass consumption. The production system is too efficient to permit it to produce as much as possible. It depletes non-renewable resources and pollutes the renewable ones. It produces far more than the society can and should reasonably consume. When efficient production and growth in production become valued for themselves, they lay waste to the land. Mines are played out. Forests are stripped. Wells are emptied. Rivers and atmosphere are polluted. Species of animals and plants are driven to extinction. When consumption becomes valued as the primary means of achieving the good life, the combined values of consumption and production result in waste of colossal proportions. Gluttony, intemperance, selfishness, waste, and rapaciousness are not worthwhile values to pursue. Certainly, one should not predicate one's self esteem upon how much one unreasonably produces and mindlessly consumes.

On this point, schools have contributed to misleading the nation's youth into valuing production and consumption. The advice so often offered in schools is that some subject or other should be studied and learned because it enhances one's employment prospects. The full extension of this argument is that schooling is good because it enhances employability. Employability is good because it leads to employment. Employment is good because it contributes to production and earns income for consumption. Production is

good because it provides goods and services for consumption. Consumption is good because it is the means to happiness. Happiness is the ultimate, intrinsic value in life. The difficulty with this argument is what has already been noted. Production and consumption, efficiently and voraciously pursued, are rapacious of resources, extravagantly wasteful, and ultimately self destructive. Education for production is not a worthwhile rationale for the curriculum of schools in an industrialised and technologically efficient society. Schools need to offer something better than this for their nation's children and youth.

One alternative to education for production and consumption is education for leisure. School programs for sport, recreation, and health are embodiments of education for leisure. The rationale for these programs goes something like this. The efficiency of modern economic production techniques reduces the need for human labour. The result is less time required for work (labour for wage, service for fee, commission, or salary) and proportionally more time available for leisure. Leisure time is unwisely spent in passive spectator activities such as watching sporting events, consuming alcohol and tobacco, and indulging in drug abuse. This passivity is detrimental to our health, and it ultimately shortens our lives. It is better to become physically active. We should use our leisure to develop physical fitness and to maintain ourselves in a healthy condition. The argument for education for leisure is an improvement upon education for production and consumption, but it still sells our youth short. A healthy condition is, of course, a worthwhile state of affairs. It merits investment of time in sporting activities, regular exercise, and recreational pursuits in order to achieve and maintain physical well being. A sound diet should be followed, and drugs should not be abused. It would be difficult to find fault with any of this. Yet education for leisure remains an inadequate rationale for the education of our children and youth, and indeed, for our adult population. It implies

that we should predicate our self esteem upon the degree of our physical fitness, our sporting prowess, and our state of health. Is this to be a substitute for self esteem based upon how much one unreasonable produces and mindlessly consumes? It is an improvement over that, but it is still fundamentally flawed. The major fault with education for leisure is that it is education for idleness. It accepts as given that there is work (labour for wage) and there is time off from work (leisure). It proposes a set of idle pastimes to fill in the idle hours. It distinguishes between harmful, self destructive pastimes and beneficial, self constructive pastimes. It argues soundly for engaging in the beneficial, constructive ones. But the pastimes which derive from education for leisure remain just that, pastimes, agreeable amusements, pleasant diversions, harmless idleness. Human beings can and should achieve more with their lives than pass their time engaged in agreeable amusements, however beneficial these are to physical and mental health.

A third possibility (alternative to education for leisure and education for production and consumption) is education for power. Highly exclusive schools offer this alternative, those with elite social status, demanding admission standards, and costly fees. By their very nature, such schools are for the few, and their function is to catapult their students to the top of the heap in the competition for positions in the professions, corporate management, and political office. These schools embrace the traditional competitive academic curriculum wholeheartedly and attract a clientele who seriously aspire to attaining and perpetuating high social status, significant economic influence, and political power and leadership. One important implication of education for power is that one's self esteem should be predicated upon the degree of economic influence, social standing, and political power which one wields. Dominance, control, and influence are the primary values implied by education for power. Such values are suspect,

even when tempered by a sense of obligation to serve in the best interests of the society, because they form the basis for the autocratic viewpoint. A sense of obligation to act as a trustee merely transforms an autocratic viewpoint into a patronising autocratic viewpoint. The chief difficulty with an autocratic viewpoint, patronising or not, is that it is willful. It does not respect reasonable viewpoints which conflict with its own. It merely attempts to manipulate them, manoeuvre around them, or overwhelm them with force. Willfulness is not to be recommended to our children and youth as a fundamental value because it excludes reasonableness. Such an exclusion is ultimately destructive of self and destructive of society. This is why education for power is not desirable. Curricula based upon it should not be offered to our youth. We can surely do better than to commend the values of power, influence, control, and willfulness.

If education for production and consumption, education for leisure, and education for power are inadequate, what alternatives remain? One which shows promise is education for freedom and education for living well as a human being (education for humanisation). Freedom has a negative and a positive sense. In its negative sense, freedom is provided when a person is let alone, unrestrained. In the story of The Lady or the Tiger, the protagonist is free in the negative sense. He is unrestrained in his choice of which door to open, but he does not have freedom that is borne out of knowing which door to choose. He has **freedom from**, but not **freedom for**. Education for freedom implies teaching and studying a curriculum which is intended to enhance self determination, individuality, and intelligent action. It is education for positive freedom, i.e., for **freedom for**. **Freedom for** is action which emanates from the method of intelligence, in the Deweyan sense. Intelligence is inadequately conceived when it is thought of as "native endowments of individuals" (Dewey, 1935,69). Rather it is much more constructive to conceive of intelligence

(from an educological point of view) as "the power of individuals to appropriate and respond to . . . the knowledge, ideas and purposes that have been integrated in the medium in which individuals live." (Dewey, 1935,69) Education for freedom is education which enhances self determination, individuality, and intelligent action. It relates closely to education for humanisation, i.e., education for the purpose of developing those qualities which enable us to live in ways that are befitting of human beings. To inquire, to learn, to reason, and to live one's life intelligently in relation to those three processes form the basis for treating one's self in ways that are befitting of a human being. Education for humanisation is education for the extension of cognition in all of its kinds, forms, and levels. A curriculum for humanisation engenders respect for evidence and reasonable argument. It enhances the disposition to inquire systematically and carefully. It promotes development of the abilities to use appropriate means to collect necessary and sufficient evidence for resolution of problems and for formulation of constructive, reasonable actions in relation to worthwhile and authentically chosen intentions and purposes. In answer to the question, why study any particular subject in school, education for freedom and humanisation offers this rationale: The study of any subject should be for the enhancement of one's ability to distinguish intelligently and authentically between desirable and undesirable goals to set for one's self. Moreover, the study of a subject should contribute to one's ability to pursue one's worthwhile goals with intelligence and responsibility, with a sense of self determination, and with due regard for the concerns and rights of others. Curriculum derived from education for freedom and humanisation includes the study of three large domains of knowledge with respect to the objects of the study: the physical, the biological, and the hominological. (Steiner, 1981). The curriculum must also include studies intended to develop three kinds of knowing: the qualitative, the quantitative, and the procedural. (Maccia, 1973 a,b,c) Qualitative knowing includes recognitive, acquaintive, and

appreciative knowing. Quantitative knowing includes instantive, evidential, and criterial knowing. Procedural knowing includes protocolic, standard, innovative, and creative knowing. (Maccia, 1973 a,b,c) The qualitative is necessary to make us sensitive to the degree that is befitting of human beings. The quantitative is requisite for making us theoretically and criterially adequate to the degree that is befitting of human beings. The procedural is needed to make us procedurally adequate to the degree that is befitting of human beings. In addition to objects of knowing and kinds of knowing, the curriculum must include studies which develop our forms of knowing. At least six forms should be included: linguistic (conceptual or symbolic), emotional, imaginal, physical, physiological, and conative. (Christensen, 1983) Levels of knowing which must necessarily be included in the curriculum are pre-conventional and conventional knowing. (Christensen, 1983) Post-conventional knowing (Christensen, 1983) is created rather than taught, but teachers can be taught how to recognise it and how to establish conditions which favour its development. This must necessarily be a feature of the curriculum as well. The measure of self esteem implied by education for freedom and humanisation is the degree to which one lives in ways befitting to a human being and the degree to which one treats others in ways which are befitting of human beings. The primary values which education for freedom and humanisation promotes include open and free inquiry, sound evidential and criterial argumentation, resolution of conflict through reasonable and rational discourse, mindful and authentic action based upon reflection and intelligent inquiry (Dewey's method of intelligence), a due regard for the interests of self and for the rights of others, and a disposition to inquire in order to know what truths can be known and to use those truths intelligently for worthwhile purposes. Education for freedom and humanisation prizes frugality in consumption (a reasonable approach to consumption, consuming according to one's needs and always conceiving of needs in minimal terms) and begrudges time required for human labour in production and distribution.

Education for freedom and humanisation accepts the necessity for work (labour for wage, service for fee or salary) in order to produce the goods and services necessary for reasonable consumption. But it does not support the view that work (labour for wage, service for fee or salary) is inherently good in and of itself. It tolerates employment (labour for wage, service for fee) as a necessary evil, a sacrifice of part of one's time because a machine can not do the job required for the well being of the society. Employment or work, however, is time taken away from the time available to pursue one's interests as a human being. Unemployment is time for rejoicing (provided there is consumer democracy), for it provides freedom from work and freedom for the further development of one's humanisation. Thus, education for freedom and humanisation is not concerned with developing employable skills. Technical, vocational, and professional education can take care of that task as the necessity arises, i.e., when production is insufficient to satisfy reasonable, frugal consumption, or when circumstances require replacement labour within the system of production and distribution. Education for freedom and humanisation, moreover, tolerates education for leisure, but it would maintain that education for leisure has far less importance than education for freedom on the grounds that idleness is not befitting of human beings. Education for freedom and humanisation rejects education for power on the grounds that willfulness is patently unbecoming of human beings and contrary to the conditions necessary for freedom.

Some argue that technological unemployment is only a temporary condition. New employment will emerge, they predict, from the technology. Blacksmiths, wainwrights, and ferriers have all but vanished, but now we have auto mechanics, service station attendants, and tyre repairers. What will the future bring? Surely something. We simply can not foresee the new jobs, at the moment, but they will emerge in due course. If this prediction proves true, it will be

a retrograde step. It would be a sad state of affairs for the freedom from work which has been gained through technology to be only a temporary achievement. It is a far preferable state of affairs that technological unemployment (freedom from work) be a permanent condition and that it be accompanied by the establishment of a consumer democracy, a system of equitable and reasonable access to goods and services, based on frugally conceived need. Given these social and economic circumstances, a curriculum which emphasises education for freedom and education for living well as a human being should take priority over a curriculum which emphasises education for employment or education for fame, fortune, power, and status. A curriculum which derives from education for freedom and humanisation encompasses the learning goals of the ability to enter into caring relationships (vs. those for monetary gain), engage in sound inquiry (vs. reliance upon gossip, innuendo, hearsay, superstition, prejudice), and undertake well informed social, economic, and political action.

There may be other sound, worthwhile alternatives (i.e., alternative to education for production, for leisure, for power, for freedom) which we have not yet conceived. Yet the facts are clear. Unemployment is a persistent condition of modern life. The response of the past ten years within Australia has been to offer greater provision in technical and vocational education, i.e., education for employment and production. Unemployment continues to be with us, especially among youth. What to do about this condition continues to be a pressing issue. The issue is partly social, partly economic, partly political, and partly educational. Those who are engaged in educological studies to qualify as professional teachers in this the last 15 years of the 20th century have a professional obligation to reflect upon what constitutes a sound basis for curricular selections for the children and youth of Australia. Are professional teachers to continue to tell their pupils who face the dawn of the 21st century that they should study

the school curriculum to enhance their job prospects? Is there no better alternative? This issue will not go away. It confronts all of us who engage in educological studies and who undertake professional teaching. What will our response to this challenge be?

References

- Christensen, J.E. (1981a): *Curriculum, Education, and Educology*, Sydney, Educology Research Associates.
- Christensen, J.E., ed. (1981b): *Perspectives on Education as Educology*, Washington, D.C., University Press of America.
- Christensen, J.E. (1983): "Cognition, Knowing, and Understanding: Levels, Forms, and Range," *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education*, Canberra, ACT, AERA.
- Christensen, J.E. (1984): "Curriculum for a Future with Permanent Technological Unemployment," *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education*, Perth, Western Australia, AERA.
- Christensen, J.E., and Fisher, J.E. (1983): *Organization and Colleges of Education: An Educological Perspective*, Sydney, Educology Research Associates.
- Dewey, J. (1935): *Liberalism and Social Action*, New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Knowles, M.S. (1970): *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy versus Pedagogy*, New York, Association Press.
- Maccia, G.S. (1973a): "Contributions of Epistemology Toward a Science of Education," a paper presented to the International Congress of the International Association for the Advancement of Educational Research, the University of Paris.
- Maccia, G.S. (1973b): "Educological Epistemology," a paper presented to the 1973 annual meeting of the Ohio Valley Philosophy of Education Society, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Maccia, G.S. (1973c): "Epistemological Considerations of Educational Objectives," a paper presented to the Philosophy of Education Section of the XVth World Congress of Philosophy, Varna, Bulgaria.
- Maccia, G.S. (1977): "Education for Humanity," a paper presented to a Symposium on Philosophy of Education, the Philosophical Society, State University of New York, Fredonia, New York.
- Maccia, G.S. (1984): "Robotic Learning and Rational Inter-

dependence," a paper presented to the Fifth World Congress of Comparative Education Societies, University of Paris.

Mill, J.S. (1846): *A System of Logic*, New York.

Steiner, E. (1981): *Educology of the Free*, New York, Philosophical Library.

Steiner, E. (1984). "Agora Through Education for Freedom," a paper presented to the Fifth World Congress of Comparative Education Societies, University of Paris.

Stones, E. (1979): *Psychopedagogy: Psychological Theory and the Practice of Teaching*, London, Methuen & Co.